

**No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/11450.**—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Hyderabad Asbestos Cement Products Ltd. Ballabgarh.

**BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**  
**Reference No. 530 of 1978**

*between*

**SHRI BAL KISHAN SHARMA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S  
HYDERABAD ASBESTOS CEMENT PRODUCTS LTD. BALLABGARH**

*Present:*

Workman in person.

Shri O. P. Sethi, for the management.

#### **AWARD**

By order No. ID/FD/104-78/50119, dated 22nd November, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Hyderabad Asbestos Cement Products Ltd., Ballabgarh and its workman Shri Bal Kishan, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

**Whether the termination of services of Shri Bal Kishan Sharma, was justified and in order ?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?**

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 10th August, 1979 and the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. On the last date of hearing, the representative for the management stated that a settlement has been arrived at between the parties. The settlement is Ex. M-1. The receipt is Ex. M-2. According to the settlement the workman has received a sum of Rs. 18,914-40 from the management in cash. The workman has forgone his right of reinstatement and re-employment and any claim if due. The workman Shri Bal Kishan Sharma agreed to it.

In view of the statements given by the parties and settlement Ex. M-1, I give my award that the workman has settled his dispute with the management and has received a sum of Rs 18,914-40 from the management in full and final settlement of all his dispute and claims if due, including his right of reinstatement and re-employment. The workman is not entitled to any further relief.

Dated the 6th October, 1980.

**M. C. BHARDWAJ,**  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

o No. 888, dated the 7th October, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

**M. C. BHARDWAJ,**  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

**No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/11453.**—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Precision Stampings, Sector-24, Faridabad.

**BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

**Reference No. 581 of 1978**

*between*

**SHRI JAG SARUP, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. PRECISION  
STAMPINGS, SECTOR, 24 FARIDABAD**

*Present :—*

Shri S. R. Gupta, for the workman.

Shri S. L. Gupta, for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. FD/II/8178/56500, dated 19th December, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. precision Stampings, Sector-24, Faridabad and its workman Shri Jag Sarup, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Jag Sarup, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties, appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues are framed on 15th June, 1979 and the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management took many opportunities but did not lead any. Then the representative for the workman Shri S. R. Gupta, stated that he did not want to appear in this case. The workman also did not appear. It seems that the workman is not taking interest in pursuing his case.

I, therefore, give my award that the workman is not interested in pursuing his case and there is no dispute now pending for adjudication.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Dated the 7th October, 1980.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 898, dated the 7th October, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/11459.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Hyderabad Asbestos Cement Products Ltd., Ballabgarh.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 259 of 1979

*between*

SHRI KHILLONI WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HYDERABAD  
ASBESTOS CEMENT PRODUCTS LTD., BALLABGARH

*Present:*

Shri S. R. Gupta for the workman.

Shri O. P. Sethi for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. 35748, dated 17th August, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Hyderabad Asbestos Cement Products Ltd., Ballabgarh and its workman Shri Khilloni to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Khilloni was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 20th February, 1980. But on the last date of hearing the representative for the management stated that the dispute has settled between parties. Settlement is Ex. M-1. He further stated that the workman has received a sum of Rs. 5,500 from the management in full and final settlement forgoing his right of reinstatement and re-employment and any other claim if due. The representative for the workman agreed to it. In view of the statements given by the parties, I give my award that the workman has settled the dispute with the management and has received a sum Rs. 5,500 from management in full and final settlement forgoing his right of reinstatement and re-employment and any other claim if due.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Dated the 10th October, 1980.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 929, dated the 10th October, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab./11463.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Dhavsons Pharmaceutical, Sector 6, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 378 of 1978

*Between*

SHRI KALIKA PARSHAD, WORKMAN AND, THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S DHAVSONS  
PHARMACEUTICAL, SECTOR 6, FARIDABAD.

*Present: —*

Shri P. K. De, for the workman

Shri H. R. Dua, for the management.

#### AWARD

1. By order No. ID/FD/59-78/39014, dated 28th August, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Dhavsons Pharmaceuticals, Sector 6, Faridabad, and its workman Shri Kalika Parshad, to this tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947;—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Kalika Prashad was justified and in order? If, not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 7th February, 1979 :—

1. Whether the workman settled his accounts fully and finally ?
2. Whether the workman is gainfully employed ? If so, to what effect ?
3. Whether the termination of service of the workman was justified and in order ?
4. If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined Shri Vinod Kumar partner as MW-1 and closed their case. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman who was afforded many opportunities but did not adduce any evidence. Arguments were heard. Now I give my finding issueswise :—

**Issue No. 1 :—**MW-1 stated that the workman left the factory after settlement of all his accounts. He produced Ex. M-1 and M-2. In cross examination he stated that the workman had not gone on leave. Ex. M-1 and M-2 were also shown to the conciliation Officer. He further stated that the workman had settled his accounts of his own. I have gone through Ex. M-1 which is a receipt of Rs. 73-90 in full and final settlement of all his dues. It is stamped and signed by the workman. Looking to the statement and of document produced by the management, I decide this issue in favour of the management.

**Issue No. 2 to 4 :—** There is no necessity to decide this issue as the workman had settled his accounts and left the services of his own.

As per finding given by me on issue No. 1, the workman has settled the dispute with the management and has received his full and final dues. The workman is not entitled to any relief.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Dated 29th September, 1980

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No: 878, dated 6th October, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/11466.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Jawala Textile Mills, Gurgaon :—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 247 of 1976

Between

SHRI BABU LAL WORKMAN, AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S JAWALA TEXTILE  
MILLS, GURGAON.

Present.—

Shri S. R. Gupta, for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD ♦

By order No. ID/GGN-31-G-76/43390, dated 23rd November, 1976, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Jawala Textile Mills, Gurgaon and its workman Shri Babu Lal, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Babu Lal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 18th February, 1977 :—

1. Whether the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?
2. Whether the workman raised the demand under reference with the employer directly? If not, to what effect?
3. Whether Shri Chander Singh, the authorised representative of the workman have no authority to sign the statement of claim?
4. Whether the workman concerned is moved the Conciliation Officer after a lapse of about one year and three months? If so, to what effect?
5. Whether the workman concerned is gainfully employed elsewhere, or is running his own shop? If so, to what effect?

Parties were called upon to adduce there evidence on the vires of the enquiry. The enquiry was held proper,—vide order, dated 4th February, 1980. This is into evidence that the management changed during the course of proceedings and the workman was reinstated by the vandeers of the company before 4th February, 1980.

The workman made a statement that he had been reinstated, however, back wages were not given to him. The workman appeared as WWI and stated that h's work and conduct while in service was satisfactory. His services were terminated due to his being a member of the union and also for his union activities. The workman has held guilty of all the charges by the Enquiry Officer. The enquiry has been held proper as already been stated. The workman has already been reinstated by the new management. Looking to the charges he is not entitled to any back wages.

While answering the reference, I give my award that the workman has already been reinstated by the management. The workman is not entitled to any further relief.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Dated the 8th October, 1980.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 907, dated 9th October, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

H. L. GUGNANI, Secy.

राजस्व विभाग

युद्ध जागीर

दिनांक, 31 अक्टूबर, 1980

क्रमांक 1749-ज(II)-80/38728.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उसमें आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए) (1ए) तथा 3(1ए) के अनुसार सौंपे गए अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्रीमती मैना देवी, विधवा श्री चन्द्रभान, गांव सुरहली, तहसील झज्जर, जिला रोहतक को रबी, 1973 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक तथा रबी, 1980 से 300 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।